

CHERAW GAZETTE

AND

PEE DEE FARMER.

M. MacLean, Editor and Proprietor.

CHERAW, S. C. FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 1839.

Vol. IV. No. 22.

TERMS.

If paid within three months, 00
If paid within three months after the close of the year, 3 50
If paid within twelve months after the close of the year, 4 00
If not paid within that time, 4 00

A company of ten persons taking the paper at the same Post Office, shall be entitled to it at \$25 provided the names be forwarded together, and accompanied by the money.

No paper to be discontinued but at the option of the editor till arrears are paid.

Advertisements not exceeding sixteen lines, inserted for one dollar the first time, and fifty cents, each subsequent insertion.

Persons sending in advertisements are requested to specify the number of times they are to be inserted; otherwise they will be continued till ordered out, and charged accordingly.

The Postage must be paid on all communications.

ANTHON'S SERIES, OF SCHOOL CLASSICS.

PROFESSOR Anthon of Columbia College, New York, is editing a series of classical works for the use of schools and Colleges to consist of perhaps thirty volumes. The ripe scholarship of the Editor is an abundant pledge to all interested, that the text adopted will be the purest, that the English Commentaries will be judicious and learned, and that all other suitable aids to a right understanding of the original, will be liberally furnished. This pledge is fully redeemed in the volumes already published, which are, Latin Lessons, a new Greek Grammar, Greek Prosody, Sallust, Cicero, and Horace, all of which may be examined or purchased at the "Bookstore." April 5, 1839.

Wadesboro Academy.

THE Trustees of the Wadesboro Academy have the pleasure to announce to Parents and Guardians, that they have employed the Rev. P. B. Wiley, A. M. and the Rev. Alex. B. Smith to take charge of the institution Mr. Wiley has been teaching for fifteen years, and Mr. Smith nine or ten.

The Trustees confidently recommend that under the charge of these gentlemen the moral culture of the students, will be no less an object of attention on the part of the Teachers, than their improvement in Literature. Students can be prepared to enter the University of our own State, or any College in our Country.

The exercises of the School will commence on the 2nd Monday of April next.

Terms of Tuition.

Spelling reading writing & Arithmetic, per quarter	\$5
The more advanced branches, sciences &c. per quarter	6
Languages—Latin and Greek, per quarter	8

Payable in advance at commencement of each quarter.

By order of the Trustees,
JNO. A. McRAE, Secy.
Wadesboro N. C. March 25th. 1839.

AGRICULTURAL CONVENTION.

An Agricultural Convention was held in Albany N. Y. on the 5th and 6th of February, from the proceedings of which, reported for the Genessee Farmer, we make the following extract.

February 5.

Mr. Buel, from the committee appointed to prepare business for the Convention, reported, in part, the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, the culture of silk is an object well worthy of legislative encouragement by the offering of bounties for a limited number of years for its production.

2. Resolved, That this Convention regard the culture of the sugar beet, with a view to the production of sugar as a branch of Agriculture, which may be prosecuted to the very great advancement of the prosperity of the State, and recommend it as well entitled to legislative encouragement by the offer of liberal bounties.

3. Resolved, That this Convention regard it of very great importance that a brief treatise, containing plain directions for the growing of the mulberry, and the management of silk worms should be prepared and distributed to each of the common schools in this State.

4. Resolved, That the introduction into all the common schools of this State, of a short practical treatise containing plain, simple directions for growing the sugar beet, according to the latest and best process, would in the opinion of this Convention greatly contribute to the general introduction of this new branch of national industry, which promises so greatly to increase the prosperity and promote the welfare of the people of this State.

5. Resolved, That this Convention cordially concur in the recommendation of his excellency the Governor, in his annual message to the present Legislature, that publications upon Agriculture, Horticulture, and Rural Economy, ought to constitute a part of every common school library.

6. Resolved, That this Convention respectfully and earnestly recommend that the Legislature make provisions for procuring and distributing the above named publications, and that the expense thereof be defrayed out of the fund appropriated for common school libraries.

After some debate, in which several gentlemen took part, the three first resolutions were adopted, when the Convention adjourned till 4 P. M. on Wednesday.

Wednesday, Feb. 6.

The three last resolutions submitted yesterday by Mr. Buel, were taken up, discussed, and adopted.

Mr. Buel, from the committee appointed to prepare business for the Convention, reported the following resolutions.

great business of the State—whether we regard the numbers it employs, the magnitude of its products, or the wealth and comfort which it confers—so it ought, at all times, to receive the peculiar and fostering care of the representatives of the people.

8. Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, agriculture has not hitherto received, from the people's representatives, that stimulus to improvement which sound policy would justify, and which equal justice and the best interest of the state demand.

9. Resolved, That the products of our soil may be vastly increased, our revenue augmented, the wealth and comfort of every class of our citizens promoted, and the character and prospects of our state elevated—by a judicious and liberal appropriation of public moneys to enlighten, to stimulate and to reward, that numerous portion of our fellow citizens who are employed in the business of agriculture.

10. Resolved, That an annual appropriation of twenty-five thousand dollars of public moneys ought to be made, for a term of years, to encourage improvements in agriculture; and that in the opinion of this Convention it will return an annual interest to the treasury, and compound interest to the State.

11. Resolved, That the general principles of the bill to encourage agriculture, reported at the last session of the legislature by the committee on agriculture, meet the views of this Convention, and that we respectfully request that those principles be adopted by the Legislature now in session.

12. Resolved, That the American Institute richly deserves the fostering care and liberal patronage of the Legislature, as an institution which has already done much good to the state, and which is eminently calculated to promote great and rapid improvement in the mechanic and manufacturing arts and materially to aid in the improvement of agriculture.

13. Resolved, That the offer of liberal rewards for the discovery of preventives to the depredations of the grain, weevil worm, hessian fly, and insect enemies, which prey upon and seriously injure our farm crops, while it might effect much good, by leading to useful discoveries, could not result in loss to the state, inasmuch as the benefits of the discovery, if any should be made deserving of the rewards, would greatly over-balance their amount.

14. Resolved, That the establishment of common school libraries will form an important era in our history, and is eminently calculated to advance us in the march of useful knowledge, to multiply our domestic and social comforts, and to elevate our character—provided that judicious selections of books are made for such libraries—adapted to the capacities and understandings of those whom they are designed to benefit, to the wants and improvement of the various branches of productive industry, and to the promotion of industrious and moral habits in the rising generation; and that in this view of the subject, the appointment of a competent board to prepare, or cause to be prepared, a selection of books for common school libraries, by the Legislature, at least so far as the public moneys are to be applied to this object, is called for by the highest considerations of public usefulness.

After some discussion, the above resolutions were severally adopted, except the 13th; for which Mr. Clark, of Washington, offered the following substitute, which was adopted in its stead.

Whereas, the growing of wheat is a business of great importance, not only to the agricultural but also to the mercantile, manufacturing, commercial and financial interests of this state:—And whereas, the eastern and northern portions of the state have, for some years past, been visited by the ravages of insects which have destroyed the crops therein, and reduced the farming interests thereof to dependence on their western neighbors for their supplies of flour; And whereas, this Convention view with alarm, the rapid spread of this evil towards the fine wheat districts of the west:—

Therefore, in hopes to stop the progress of this scourge in our land, this Convention do most earnestly and confidently call upon and request the legislature now in session, to authorize the governor or some other suitable person or persons, to offer a reward to any person or persons who shall discover and make public any remedy for preventing or counteracting the effects of these insects. Such bounty to be paid out of the treasury of this State.

And whereas, also, a knowledge of the character and habits of these insects may lead to the discovery of a course of husbandry which may avoid the deleterious effects of the labors of these insect.

Therefore, this Convention do also request that the Governor may be further authorized and required to offer a reward for the best treatise on the habits, character and nature of these insects. Such treatise to be submitted to and determined by a board for that purpose to be appointed.

Gen. Clark offered the following resolution, which was adopted, and Messrs. J. B. Wakeman of New York, C. Bergea and Gen. Johnson of Kins, P. Potter of Dutchess, J. J. Vicle of Rensselaer, and A. Van Bergen of Green, were appointed a committee to prepare the report.

Resolved, That a committee of six members of this Convention be appointed to prepare a Report on the future prospects of Agricultural, Manufacturers and the Mechanic Arts in this State, to be illustrated by such statistics as the committee may deem appropriate, and that the Report,

when completed, be published in the Cultivator, the Genessee Farmer, and the Journal of the American Institute.

Mr. Walsh of Rensselaer, offered the following resolution, which was adopted, and the committee appointed thereon were Messrs. Duane of Seneca, Sacket of Seneca, Spang of Monroe, Allen of Erie, and Clark of Washington.

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to confer with the members of our Legislature on the expediency of making an appropriation of public moneys in aid of the improvement of our husbandry.

On motion of Mr. Fry of Montgomery. Resolved, That this Convention recommend the holding of a State Agricultural Convention, in the Capitol, in the city of Albany, on the first Tuesday of February 1840.

On motion of Mr. Young, of Tompkins.

Resolved, That Messrs. Buel, Cheever and Bement be appointed a committee for the express purpose of conferring with the Agricultural Committee of both Houses of the Legislature, upon the subject of the proposed reward, in relation to the wheat insect.

The Convention then adjourned *Sine die*.

From the Milledgeville (Ga.) Journal. QUACKERY EXPOSED.

A friend has placed in our hands, a neat little paper, published in Philadelphia, and entitled the NATIONAL SILK WORM. His chief object is, to advance the culture of American Silk, but we are happy to see, that whilst engaged in the dissemination of useful information on this subject, the Editor has undertaken to foster a much more important interest, than the sale of Mulberry trees, or the production of Silk—he has voluntarily entered the lists, in defence of the health of the people, against the destructive machinations of empiricism. In his first issue, he has run full tilt against Dr. J. Priestly Peters, and after a smart application of the lash, left him without a single covering for his base designs against the health, and lives of his fellow-beings. He has not only exposed his brazen attempts at deception, but, by the united testimony of several distinguished individuals, convicted him of gross and malicious falsehood. The article in question will be found in another column of this days paper headed "Base Imposition."

We happen to be acquainted with some passages in the history of this PETERA. He came to this place about 8 years ago, and presenting to the Medical Society, a diploma from some obscure College at the North, applied for license to practice Medicine. Considering the parchment exhibited, as sufficient evidence of his competency, after a very slight examination, the Board according to usage conferred upon him authority to practice.

Several gentlemen who composed that Board have since expressed their regrets, because of his not having been subjected to a more rigid examination,—as they afterwards became fully satisfied, that he was without qualifications, and unable to have passed creditable examination. Having obtained the license, he immediately set about the preparation and sale of a nostrum, which was styled, "Medicina Stomachica et Hepatica!" This medicine was recommended to the public not only as a sovereign remedy for Liver Complaints, but by its action on the stomach, a certain cure for almost every disease to which human nature is liable. For two or three years he continued to flourish in the newspapers, and through the country, and by some means succeeded in obtaining for his medicine the sanction of several respectable names. But the business became rather dull, when he suddenly changed tack, and came out with a new article, under the title of "Vegetable Pills" whose virtues were said to be vastly more wonderful than those of the liquid preparation with the long name.

These Pills were represented to be purely vegetable, and perfectly harmless in their operations upon the system. It is believed, that the falsity of this latter assertion, can be established by many witnesses. We know of one gentleman in a neighboring county, who was induced to try them for some disease, and the result was, a severe salivation—from the effects of which, he has never fully recovered. They were also recommended to persons going to sea, as an excellent preventive, or remedy for sea-sickness. Several gentlemen of this place happened in company with Peters on board the steam Boat bound from Charleston to Norfolk, when he removed his residence to the north, and they are unanimous in the opinion, that he suffered more from sea sickness than any other passenger on the Boat—showing that he had no confidence in his own medicines, or, that they possessed no virtue!—He left this place about four years ago for the city of New-York, where he has since resided, and as we learn, made a considerable fortune by the sale of his "Vegetable Pills." During his stay here, he was never countenanced by the respectable portion of society, nor recognized by the Medical Faculty as a qualified Physician.

We have been thus explicit, not from any personal hostility to Peters, but from a sincere desire to unmask what we believe to be a gross deception, and if possible, rescue the people from a fatal delusion, by which hundreds are no doubt yearly precipitated to an untimely end.

CORRECTION.

Our attention has been called to an error of some consequence, which occurred in

our last week's publication, respecting Dr. Peters. We stated that he presented to the Medical Society a Diploma, and applied for license to practice, which, after a very slight examination, was granted. It appears, that under the law, as it then existed, the presentation of a Diploma, was deemed sufficient evidence of competency and the Board had no authority to subject the applicant to examination. Of course, if there be blame, it should be attached to the law, and not to the Medical Board, who possessed no discretionary power.

From the National Silk Worm. BASE IMPOSITION. QUACK MEDICINE.

The Editor of the Silk Worm considers it a duty he owes to the community, to put invalids, on their guard against a quack imposture now attempted to be palmed off under the name of "Peters' Vegetable Pills." Were this an imposition that affected merely the pockets of purchasers, we should consider it less incumbent upon us to make this exposure; but tampering, as it does, with health and with the lives of the people, we do not for a moment hesitate to hold up this new attempt at deception and imposition in its true light. Health is emphatically "the poor man's blessing;" too often it is the only one he can boast of, and we abhor, from our souls, the wretch who, for filthy lucre, can set down and deliberately concoct falsehood, for the purpose of scattering pills for portions throughout the land, the indiscriminate use of which, is destructive of health Brande's Pills," after ruining or impairing the health of scores, for every one they benefited, have had their day, and are now fast settling to their proper level. The success of that nostrum has induced others to enter the field, and among them flourishes conspicuously, "Dr. Jos. Priestly Peters," whose pretensions we shall take it upon ourselves to expose in a thorough and efficient manner, at our earliest convenience. In the meantime we caution the public against placing any reliance in the certificates and recommendations with which he is filling the papers, and by means of which he expects to deceive and mislead the credulous.

We have a right to be thus explicit, when we have in our possession conclusive evidence, in relation to the direct and positive falsehood of several portions of his published statement, and have therefore a right to infer the falsehood of the whole. Fictitious recommendations and certificates of quack nostrums, shall not be palmed off upon this community with impunity—and after having disposed of this case of imposture in a satisfactory manner, we intend to take up other similar humbugs which our city is infested, having determined to do what lies in our power, to prevent sickness and disease from being made the sport of unfeeling and mercenary speculators.

In his pamphlet and newspaper advertisements, Priestly Peters asserts that he "has the pleasure of informing the public that his Pills have received the direct sanction and patronage of the following distinguished individuals:—

Here follows the names of a score of public functionaries at the seat of government and elsewhere, including the President of the United States, Ex-Presidents, Senators, Governors of five States, Bishops, and the Post-Master General. From several of these distinguished individuals, we have been politely favoured with such evidence as fits the charge of imposition upon this quack impostor conclusively. Mr. Kendall says:

"You are right in believing that such use of my name is unauthorized by me. I know nothing of those pills—have never used one of them, to my knowledge, and any assertion, by way of advertisement or otherwise, that I "sanction," or "patronise" them, is a base imposition upon the country.

"I wish you success in putting down all such quackery."

The Hon. T. H. Benton, in a communication to the Editor, says: "In answer to your enquiries I have to say, I never heard or read of Peters' Vegetable Pills, until I received your letter, and that all attempts to exhibit me as sanctioning or patronising those pills, are impudent impositions upon the public."

Letters from others, and equally distinguished individuals, among whom we may mention the Hon. Daniel Webster and the Hon. John C. Calhoun, are equally explicit in their denial of "sanctioning or patronising Peters' Vegetable Pills"—notwithstanding which, Priestly Peters has the mercenary effrontery to assure the citizens of Philadelphia, that his nostrum "has received their direct sanction and patronage."

We therefore put our citizens on their guard against this GROSS IMPOSITION—this IMPUDENT attempt to SWINDLE them out of their money and their health, and induce them to buy an article which has nothing but QUACKERY and FALSEHOOD to recommend it.

There are other impositions of a similar character, designed to fleece the poor and tamper with health, which we mean to examine into, and shall make a faithful and independent report of their merits.

REMARKS OF MR. ELY MOORE, OF NEW YORK.

The constitution over the District of Columbia, that it would not have been competent for Maryland and Virginia to have exercised prior to making the cession. The "exclusive powers of legislation," therefore, possess of by Congress over the "ten mile square," are of the kind which were never delegated to the General Government, but reserved to the States. To say that the power of "exclusive legislation," conferred upon Congress by the 10th article of the 8th section of the constitution, embraced any of the general powers contained in any of the fifteen preceding articles of the 8th section, would be to charge the framers of the constitution with granting a repetition of powers by distinct articles. This is not to be presumed. Neither is it to be presumed that the framers of the constitution, conferred upon Congress Federal powers concurrent with existing State powers. No, sir; the framers of the American constitution, as wise and patriotic men, conferred no powers upon Congress that were calculated to beget strife and contention, and instead of promoting, mar the harmony which ever ought to subsist between the National and State Governments. And equally wise and cautious were they in combining the federal and local or State powers in such manner as that Congress, in discharging the double functions of a Federal and State Legislature, should not confound, nor produce a collision between these powers or functions. Thus Congress, I repeat, as the General or Federal Legislature, exercise the general powers delegated by the States; and as a local or State Legislature, exercise, from time to time, the reserved and undelimited powers pertaining to the States. In the former capacity, Congress may declare war, or make peace, "coin money and regulate the value thereof," &c., but cannot legislate with regard to the local wants and interests of this District. But in the latter capacity, Congress may incorporate companies, build bridges, open streets—in a word, supply the wants and meet the exigencies of the District, precisely in the same manner that a State Legislature may do with regard to a State. And the laws passed by Congress in this State or local capacity, are necessarily limited in their operation to the District of Columbia, precisely as a State law is confined in its operation to the State limits. If the laws passed by Congress in their local legislative capacity had the effect of United States laws, the banks of this District would be United States banks, and the insurance companies United States insurance companies.

The District of Columbia is, in all respects, whether as a sovereignty or as a community, as much independent of the Federal Legislature, when acting in their federal capacity, as are Georgia and North Carolina, or as those States are of each other. The Federal Legislature, therefore, as such, possess no more power over the subject within the limits of this District, than they do over that subject within the limits of those States. Consequently, Congress are no more bound to receive petitions from the citizens of the States praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, than the Legislature of a sovereign and independent State would be bound to receive petitions from the citizens of the District of Columbia, touching the domestic interests and internal police of such State. Hence the popular fallacy with regard to the right of petition. The question is not as to the right of petition, but as to the direction or direction which petitions should take. Admitting that the citizens of a State have a right to petition their Legislature, touching any subject of grievance, over which the Legislature may have jurisdiction; and that the citizens of the U. S. have also a right to petition the Federal Legislature on all subjects of a federal character does it follow, therefore, that the citizens of one State have a right to petition the Legislature of another State, concerning the domestic institutions and internal police of the State? Or, that citizens of the United States have a right to petition the Federal Legislature on a subject that is not federal, but strictly local in its character, and with which the petitioners have no right to intermeddle? Certainly not. And as the citizens of Vermont or Connecticut, for example, have no more right to interfere with the domestic institutions of this District than they have with the domestic institutions of the State of Maryland or of Virginia, which is just none at all—they might, with the same propriety petition the Legislature of those States to abolish slavery within their limits, as to petition the local Legislature of this District to abolish slavery within its limits. And as it would not, and ought not, to be considered a denial of the right of petition on the part of the Legislature of either of those States to reject such petitions, so neither could it be regarded as a denial of such right for Congress, the local Legislature of the District of Columbia, (and it has been already shown that it is only in this local capacity that Congress can have jurisdiction over the subject at all,) to reject similar petitions from citizens of those or any other States. It matters not, therefore, whether Congress have the power to abolish slavery within the District of Columbia or not, as Congress is not bound, in either case, to receive petitions from the citizens of the States touching the subject of slavery within this District—such citizens having no right interfere with this, or any other subject of internal police within the District. What, sir, could it be regarded as a denial of the legitimate exercise of the right of petition on the part of Congress, to reject

petitions from citizens of the States praying Congress to narrow or widen the streets in this city, or in the city of Georgetown, or of Alexandria, or to repeal the charters of the incorporated companies within this District, or otherwise to change, alter, or in any way to affect the municipal institutions or internal police of the District? No man, I apprehend, will so allege. And why not? For the reason, sir, that the petitioners would have no right or authority to intermeddle with the local rights and interests of an independent community—a community as absolutely independent of the petitioners, in all the respects just mentioned, as are the municipalities of France? And as the institution of slavery in the District of Columbia, as well as in the slave States, is, in all respects, and to all intents and purposes, local in its character, Congress are no more bound to entertain petitions from citizens of the States, asking for its abolition, than if such petitions related to the municipal institutions of a foreign country. If Congress would not be bound to receive petitions in the one case, they would not in the other. I repeat, then, that whether Congress have the power to abolish slavery within the District of Columbia, or not, it cannot be regarded as a denial of the right of petition for Congress to reject petitions from citizens of the States, praying for the exercise of such right, no more than it would be for them to reject petitions from the subjects of a foreign power, asking for similar action. Were the institution of slavery, in the District of Columbia, general and national in its character, instead of being, as it is, strictly and essentially local and municipal, then would the citizens of the States, I grant, be authorized to petition the National Legislature concerning it: and the National Legislature, recognising the right of petition, would be bound to receive such petitions, if couched in respectful language. But under our existing form of government, and under our existing circumstances, Congress are not bound, and in truth have no legitimate right, to entertain petitions from individual residing without the limits of this District, touching the abolition of slavery, or any other subject of a local or municipal character, affecting, merely, the citizens residing within the District.

Such being my views, then, I can but regard those petitioners—residents of the States—praying Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, as guilty of an imperinent and unarrantable interference with the rights, privileges, and interests of a free and independent community. And so long, sir, as I entertain my present opinions, I shall feel constrained to reprobate any action on the part of the Congress which may be calculated to give countenance and encouragement to such mischievous and audacious interference. Sir, by receiving these petitions, we tacitly yield our assent to acts of aggression on the rights of those whom it is our peculiar duty and province to defend and protect.

Let Congress promptly reject all petitions, emanating from citizens of the States, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and this corroding and wide-spreading evil will be speedily arrested. The halls of Congress, sir, have been converted into laboratories, where this accreting mischief is compounded and refined, where it receives its point and potency, and whence it is flung upon the country.

But again, sir, Congress have no constitutional authority to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the slave owners. The constitution declares "no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law; and that private property shall not be taken for public use without compensation." An attempt to render this language of the constitution more explicit or more emphatic by any comments of mine, could but be regarded as a reflection upon the intelligence of this house. If Congress cannot constitutionally take private property, except it be for public use, and only then by making compensation to the owners thereof, and this is the only true and legitimate construction, by what authority can they wrest from citizens of this District their private property? Such acts unquestionably would be without the shadow of constitutional warrant. The advocates of abolitionism, therefore, in order to surmount this constitutional impediment to their schemes, must show, in the first place, that the citizens of the District of Columbia constitute no part of the citizens of the United States; and, in the second place, that slave property is not private property. Whenever they shall successfully do this, I will admit that the American constitution affords no guarantee against the violation of the rights of property, and that Congress may, constitutionally, abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the slave owners; but not till then.

If the citizens of this district may have one species of property arrested from them by the high hand of power, what security have they that their property of whatsoever kind will not share a similar fate? But, sir, this supposition cannot be tolerated for a moment. The doctrine strikes at the very root of all free government, and is, to all intents and purposes subversive of the social compact. In the language of the Supreme Court:—"There are acts which the Federal or State Legislatures cannot do, without exceeding their authority. There are certain vital principles in our free Republican Government, which will determine and overrule an apparent and flagrant abuse of legislative power; as to authorize multi-